

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

BRUCE CRAIGIE, an individual, and  
BARBARA CRAIGIE, an individual,

Plaintiffs,

v.

NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE, LLC, a  
limited liability company, and JOHN DOES  
1-5, unnamed individuals,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:15-cv-441

Hon. Janet T. Neff

Theodore J. Westbrook (P70834)  
**Westbrook Law PLLC**  
Attorney for Plaintiffs  
6140 28<sup>th</sup> St. SE, Suite 115  
Grand Rapids, MI 49546  
(616) 706-5618

Amanda P. Narvaes (P74957)  
**Drew, Cooper & Anding, P.C.**  
Attorney for Plaintiffs  
Aldrich Place, Suite 200  
80 Ottawa Ave. NW  
Grand Rapids, MI 49503  
(616) 454-8300

Laura C. Baucus (P56932)  
Jong-Ju Chang (P70584)  
Elisa J. Lintemuth (P74498)  
**Dykema Gossett PLLC**  
Attorneys for Nationstar Mortgage LLC  
300 Ottawa Ave. NW, Suite 700  
Grand Rapids, MI 49503  
(616) 776-7500

STIPULATION TO AMEND DISCOVERY ORDER

Plaintiffs Bruce Craigie and Barbara Craigie, and Defendant Nationstar Mortgage, LLC (“Nationstar”), by and through their counsel, stipulate and agree as follows:

1. On October 21, 2016, the Court heard argument regarding Defendant’s Motion for Protective Order and to Quash Plaintiffs’ Fourth Set of Discovery Requests and Subpoenas (ECF No. 126) and Plaintiffs’ Motion to Enforce Subpoenas and to Compel (ECF No. 131).

2. At the hearing, the Court ruled in part that Nationstar would be required to submit for *in camera* inspection: (1) documents produced to Plaintiffs in redacted form; and (2) documents withheld from production to Plaintiffs on the basis of asserted attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine.

3. The Court’s Order subsequent to the hearing (ECF No. 143) does not mention *in camera* inspection of the withheld documents as discussed in the Court’s rulings.

4. Striking and replacing the penultimate paragraph of the Court’s Order (“IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that defendant will produce ...”) with the following language comports with the Court’s rulings on October 21, 2016:

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that defendant will produce to the Court for *in camera* inspection within seven days, to determine whether attorney/client and/or attorney work product privileges were properly claimed: (1) unredacted copies of the documents that were produced to Plaintiffs in redacted form; and (2) copies of the documents withheld from production on the basis of attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine.

5. The parties agree in light of this clarification to extend the time for compliance with the Court’s order, as amended, until Monday, October 31, 2016.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Hon. Ellen S. Carmody  
United States Magistrate Judge

STIPULATED TO BY:

Dated: October 28, 2016

/s/Theodore J. Westbrook  
Theodore J. Westbrook (P70834)  
**Westbrook Law PLLC**  
Attorney for Plaintiffs  
6140 28<sup>th</sup> St. SE, Suite 115  
Grand Rapids, MI 49546  
(616) 706-5618  
twestbrook@westbrook-law.net

Dated: October 28, 2016

/s/Elisa J. Lintemuth (with permission TJW)  
Elisa J. Lintemuth (P74498)  
**Dykema Gossett PLLC**  
Attorneys for Defendant  
300 Ottawa Ave. NW  
Grand Rapids, MI 49503  
(616) 776-7500  
elintemuth@dykema.com